

Application No.: 10/557,100
Amendment Dated: March 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of: December 23, 2008

MAT-8778US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 are rejected, and claim 4 is objected to. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended, and claim 4 has been cancelled.

Applicants representatives would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of January 14, 2009. During the telephone interview, Applicant's representatives explained that "to begin an initialization for the plasma display device after a lapse of a specific period of time" is supported in at least Applicant's specification at page 8, lines 1-10 and Fig. 4. Specifically, Applicant's representatives clarified that the "specified period of time" is the time period between t1 and t3 in Fig. 4. As a result of the interview, the Examiner stated that he now has a better understanding of Applicant's claim 1.

On page 2, the Official Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Thus, Applicant has amended claim 1. Specifically, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that an "initializing waveform" is applied to the scanning electrode to begin an initialization. Also, Applicant has amended claim 1 further to state that the specific period of time occurs after supplying power to the plasma display panel. This feature is at least supported in Applicant's Fig. 4 where an initializing waveform is applied in time period t3-t5 after the specified time period between t1-t3 which includes first time period t1-t2 and second time period t2-t3. This feature is also supported on Applicant's specification on page 8 (*"after supply of power, period T0 is provided ... and after the lapse of period T0, initializing waveform 8 is issued"*).

As stated on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 4 is objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of base claim 1. Thus, Applicant has cancelled claim 4 and inserted the features of claim 4 into independent claim 1, thereby making claim 1 allowable.

Thus, since Applicant's have amended claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 4, claim 1 is now patentable over the art of record.

Application No.: 10/557,100
Amendment Dated: March 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action of: December 23, 2008

MAT-8778US

Claims 2 and 3 include all the features of the claim 1 from which they depend. Thus, claims 2 and 3 are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41, 738
Attorney for Applicant

RAE/so/fp

Dated: March 5, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

so394184